

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,012	03/30/2001	Kazuyuki Yamaguchi	P/3236-27	6753
75	90 09/30/2004		EXAM	INER
Steven I Weisburd Esq Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP 1177 Avenue of the Americas - 4st Floor New Y ork, NY 10036-2714			ESCALANTE, OVIDIO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	
		•	DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/823,012	YAMAGUCHI, KAZUYUKI			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ovidio Escalante	2645			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application in the same of t	ation. A proper reply to a chapter the application in			
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 Cl of extension and the corresponding aming the shortened statutory period for reply	ring date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'	CFR 1.704(b).				
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: at		idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	, — ·			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	• •	•			
Claim(s) allowed: 2,5,9 and 10.					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-4,6-8</u> .		•			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•			
10. Other:					
		FAN TSANG ERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Advisory Action

Part of Paper-No. 20040924

Application/Control Number: 09/823,012

Art Unit: 2645

Advisory Action

Applicant contends that that Uchiyama does not teach each gateway unit inquires at each other gateway unit whether identification information of said mobile communication terminal is registered in a service management information storing section. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Uchiyama was relied upon for the teaching of having a gateway generate inquiries for identification information of the mobile terminal. The cited portions of Uchiyama which include column 4 and as noted by applicant column 9 both teach that it was well known in the art to generate inquiries for inquiring about identification information. Specifically, col. 9, lines 46-59 specifically state that a gateway (GMSC262) requests information (inquires) about the mobile subscriber to a second gateway and that the second gateway (GLR241) searches for the information and returns to information to the gateway (GMSC262).

Since the prior art clearly teaches that it was well known in the art to inquire information from a gateway, the Examiner believes that there are sufficient teachings to present a *prima facie* case and thus the rejection is maintained.